

ATTACHMENT 2

Workgroup Write-Up of 1998/99 Planning Process

**Revised Ecosystem Roundtable Approach
December 23, 1997 Revised Draft**

Issues for Discussion

The Ecosystem Roundtable and CALFED managers have agreed to revise the Roundtable's 1998 process for developing near-term spending recommendations in order to achieve the following purposes:

- A. Get back to the notion of a "virtual pool" of money.
- B. Expand the categories for spending beyond a request for proposals process to include program development, reserve funds, agency programs and other types of spending vehicles.
- C. Clarify that spending will be guided by an action plan that is (1) based on the best available science and (2) coordinated with other on-going ecosystem restoration efforts.

The revised process encompasses the following six steps and sub-steps.

1. **Assume a total amount of funding**

The Roundtable has initially chosen a three year planning period. It should assume a certain amount of total funds expected (roughly) to be available during that time.

2. **Convene a ~~Blue~~ Ribbon scientific panel to prepare a summary technical report**

The scientific panel will prepare a report for the use of the Roundtable and CALFED managers that summarizes the current status of the ERPP, AFRP and other key ecosystem restoration planning efforts with regard to the primary problems facing the Bay-Delta system and objectives for long-term action. The scientific panel will overlap or be the same as the drafting panel preparing the ERPP Strategic Plan.

1. Workgroup agreed to not use Blue Ribbon but refer to panel as scientific panel.

2. The workgroup wants this effort linked to the revisions to the ERPP and using the same or similar group would help.

January 5, 1998 CAEUDORA\ATTACH\WORKGRP1.12

3. **Prepare an Action Plan to guide spending in the near-term**
Action Plan comments: The Action Plan will include a broad array of activities geared toward addressing the ecological problems identified by the technical report. The Action Plan will be a mix of science and policy. For example, if the science indicates that the altered hydrodynamics of the Delta is a problem, there are a variety of policy calls that can be made as to how to best address this need—long-term water acquisitions, changes in annual operations, replacement of diversion works with more efficient systems, etc.

The Action Plan will include 5-8 categories of spending including, for example:

- request for proposals for specific actions
- actions best undertaken by federal, state or local agencies
- program development (when the best response to an identified need has not yet been developed sufficiently to support either agency action or a request for proposals)
- reserve funds for various purpose
- long-term endowment
- other

Steps in Preparing Action Plan

- a. Roundtable members/CALFED agencies review technical report
- b. Break into workgroups and brainstorm on the problem areas

Workgroups to be a mix of Roundtable members, technical advisors, agency representatives and perhaps others.

The purpose of these working groups is to develop an initial set of action items to address the identified ecological problems. The groups should be encouraged to think very broadly about actions; everything from very specific recommendations (e.g. replace a specific dam on a specific creek with a more "fish friendly" diversion

3. Is it appropriate to have policy and technical issues considered together?
4. The AFRP, the 97 workshops, and the ERPP all contain a lot of information on

January 5, 1998 C:\EUDORA\ATTACH\WORKGRP1.12

method) to very broad programmatic needs (e.g. someone should develop a plan to acquire water, protect the pristine habitat in the upper watersheds).

The workgroups could be based on geographic regions, type of problem, species or any other logical division. The scientific panel will be asked for guidance on the division of workgroups. For example:

- resident Delta species
- salmon research needs
- San Joaquin system
- upper watershed areas
- North Bay
- exotic species
- harvest issues
- screens and fish passage issues
- watershed conservation (i.e. preservation strategies where habitat is currently in good shape)

Each workgroup would produce a set of written actions (not proposals) deemed necessary or useful in addressing the problem the group was assigned to think about.

- c. The Stakeholders (Roundtable) prepare a Draft Action Plan based on the workgroup products

The Roundtable would hold a two to four day facilitated workshop to bring together the recommendations of the smaller groups and attempt to fashion a near-term spending plan. THIS PLAN WOULD NOT CONSTITUTE SELECTION OF INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS FOR FUNDING. It would represent a first cut at:

- (1) identifying the types of actions that should be prioritized for the near-term
- (2) the appropriate funding vehicle (RFP, directed program, reserve account, etc.)
- (3) recommendations on broad policy issues (for example, the stakeholders may want to prioritize spending on actions that cannot be implemented in the near-term but would benefit from immediate financial support, alternatively they could make the policy call to

possible actions.

Should this information be the basis for the working groups?

5. Are Roundtable members willing and able to attend 5 to 7 workshops?

6. Are Roundtable members willing and able to attend a 2 to 4 day workshop?

January 5, 1998 CAEUDORA\ATTACH\WORKGRP1.12

favor projects immediately implementable).

To be effective and meaningful, such a workshop would require substantial preparation in terms of focusing the issues, identifying discussion points and probable areas of consensus as well as conflict.

The draft Action Plan would be written following the workshop, to the extent that the stakeholders are unable to reach agreement on various important points, the draft should identify the range of views presented.

d. CALFED Agencies feedback loop

In conjunction with the Bay-Delta Program, the CALFED agencies would review the stakeholder draft and revise it.

e. Additional feedback loops until the Action Plan is integrated

f. Release Action Plan for public review and comment
(Note: The Action Plan will have greater credibility if conflict of interest rules apply to every stage of its development. This would mean no individual or organization with a financial interest in the funds intended for expenditure would participate in the preparation of the Action Plan. This would, however, exclude participation by many consultants who have substantial knowledge as well as many grassroots environmental organizations.)

7. To expedite the process, the workgroup has discussed eliminating these feedback loops and working with CALFED on an Action Plan but having a clear point where the Roundtable has consensus on the Plan.

4. Match the available pots of money with the proposed spending items

This could be done by the Roundtable, or it could be accomplished by a subgroup of stakeholders and agency representatives, in the form of recommendations to the agencies with legal responsibility for funding. (This could be a section of the blueprint, or a separate document entirely.)

5. Implement the recommended spending plan

January 5, 1998 C:\EUDORA\ATTACH\WORK\GRP1.12

Responsibility for this task will depend upon the action item, but implementation responsibility (e.g. getting RFPs issued and processed) will necessarily lie primarily with the parties with legal responsibility for individual funding sources. However, the Roundtable (or subgroups or the Roundtable) should serve as the stake holder liaison to, and monitor of, these processes. To the extent that non-agency funding is at issue (e.g. stakeholder contributions to Category III) the Roundtable has substantially more latitude in guiding the spending process unless they would like credit from CALFED for the funds.

6. Adaptive management/program monitoring, reporting, etc.
The Roundtable should track (a) how well its recommendations are actually implemented by CALFED and the other agencies and (b) how the various programs and projects are doing in terms of providing ecosystem benefits and information.

8. Under the CALFED crediting procedures, credit can only be issued for actions approved by CALFED.

January 5, 1998 CAEUDORA\ATTACH\WORKGRP1.12

A. Revised Ecosystem Roundtable Approach: Charge to Scientific Panel

Given the following information:

- Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan draft,
- Work products from Indicators Group on conceptual models, indicators, and revised stressors,
- Anadromous Fish Restoration Plan,
- 1997 priorities in Request for Proposals and from Integration Panel,
- Relevant Endangered Species Act Recovery Plans,
- the CCMP, and
- Goals of CALFED and CVPIA

How should priorities for near-term restoration be revised so they:

- Cover a three year period,
- Are consistent with the ERPP draft as it exists at that point in time,
- Demonstrate integration of CALFED and CVPIA ecosystem restoration tools, and
- Build on restoration actions funded to date.

Specifically, the Scientific Panel should provide technical recommendations on priority for restoration efforts for each of the ecosystem elements addressed by the ERPP.

Ecosystem elements include processes, habitats, and species. These priorities should be integrated with the strategic plan for the ERPP and the conservation strategy for listed species.

B. Revisions to the Integration Panel to form the Scientific Panel:

The Integration Panel identified several areas of expertise they would want added as they move into the new role. They also identified several issues that should be considered.

Desired expertise would include:

- Landscape ecologist
- Expert in functioning of wetlands
- Botanist
- Introduced species
- Toxicologist
- Watershed management
- Fluvial Geomorphologist

The Integration Panel discussed the need to balance between agency and non-agency experts but did not develop a consensus recommendation on this issue. In looking for fresh perspectives, they also suggested looking to academia or other outside groups. The Integration Panel voiced a strong desire to stay a manageable size so they can remain productive. They indicated that 15 to 20 people was as big as the group could get.

The workgroup and CALFED staff evaluated these needs and have identified a short list of potential candidates. CALFED staff will be contacting these people to determine their

interest in participating. The current Integration Panel members are also being asked for their input on this list. Following is the list of current members and the short list developed so far:

Current Integration Panel

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Expertise</u>
Serg Birk*	CVPWA	Fisheries, Sac River watershed
Randy Brown	DWR	Fisheries, water quality
Jerry Bruns	CVRWQCB	Water quality, watershed, fisheries
Dan Castleberry	USFWS	CVPIA/AFRP, fisheries
Jim Frazier	USFS	Hydrologist, watershed
Rod Fujita*	EDF	Fisheries, ecosystem
Bruce Herbold*	EPA	Fisheries, delta emphasis
Perry Herrgesell	DFG	Fisheries
Elise Holland	BI	Fisheries, delta emphasis
Diana Jacobs	SLC	Ecologist, river physical processes
Ken Lentz	USBR	Fisheries
Terry Mills*	CALFED	Fisheries, ecosystem processes
Dave Paulin	USFWS	Migratory birds, wetlands
Tim Ramirez	Tuolumne River Pres. Trust	Hydrologist, San Joaquin watershed
Pete Rhoads*	MWDSC	Aquatic/fisheries, ecosystem

*Also participates in Indicators Group

Short List of Potential Additions

<u>Name</u>	<u>Brief Description</u>
Brenda Grewell	Botanist and wetlands expert
Chris Foe	CVRWQCB water quality expert
Elaine Archibald	Water quality consultant to CUWA
Dennis Bowker	Napa Resource Conservation District expert in watershed conservation
Bob Nuzum	EBMUD fisheries expert, Mokelumne emphasis
Bill Trush	McBain and Trush fluvial geomorphologist
Scott McBain	McBain and Trush fluvial geomorphologist
Matt Kondolf	UCB academic geomorphologist
Fred Nichols	USGS expert in introduced species

Dave Vogel and Tom Taylor are previous participants who are not currently on the Integration Panel because their schedules did not permit it. The workgroup felt it would be desirable to try to bring these two experts back. Dudley Reiser is interested in continuing to be involved but not as a regular participant. CALFED ERPP staff are also working with the stakeholders to identify a landscape ecologist who can work on the ERPP as well as on near term restoration. This person would work with the scientific panel either as staff or as a participant.

January 6, 1998 C:\BACKUP\WPDOCS\ECOSYSTEM\WORK\GRPL.WPD

1	Prior to 1/9/98	Ecosystem Roundtable Working Group (Working Group) develops recommendations for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total amount of available funding over the next three years; • Ecosystem Roundtable staffing needs; • Guidelines for Scientific Panel deliberations; • Candidates for Scientific Panel; and • Candidates to facilitate Scientific Panel deliberations.
2	1/13/98	Ecosystem Roundtable reaches consensus on Working Group recommendations (with any necessary changes) for items listed in Step 1.
3	1/13/98	CALFED Management Team review and approve Ecosystem Roundtable recommendations (with any necessary changes) for items listed in Step 1.
4	2/1/98-2/13/98	Scientific Panel is convened to prepare a Summary Technical Report ¹ for Ecosystem Roundtable and CALFED review which includes recommendations for logical division of workgroups ² based on issues covered in Report.
5	Prior to 2/16/98	Working Group develops recommendations for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates to facilitate workgroups and workshop deliberations; • Candidates for workgroups; and • Guidelines for workgroup and workshop deliberations.
6	2/20/98	Ecosystem Roundtable reaches consensus on Working Group recommendations (with any necessary changes) for items listed in Step 5 and receives Executive Summary of the Summary Technical Report.
7	2/20/98	CALFED Management Team review and approve Ecosystem Roundtable recommendations (with any necessary changes) for items listed in Step 5 above and receives Executive Summary of the Summary Technical Report..
8	3/2-16/98	Convene workgroup sessions.
9	4/1-3/98	Convene 2-day facilitated workshop to synthesize workgroup output.
10	4/9/98	Draft Action Plan ³ is prepared based on workgroup products and 2-day workshop.
11	4/17/98	Ecosystem Roundtable reaches consensus on Draft Action Plan.
12	4/17-5/1/98	CALFED Management Team review and approve Draft Action Plan (with any necessary changes).
13	5/11/98	Draft Action Plan is released for public review.
14	6/22/98	Final Action Plan is prepared.
15	6/22/98-on	Available monies are matched with proposed spending items.
16	6/22/98-on	Parties with legal responsibilities for individual funding sources implement Final Action Plan

¹ The Summary Technical Report will summarize the current status of the ERPP, AFRP and other key ecosystem restoration planning efforts with regard to the primary problems facing the Bay-Delta system and objectives for long-term action.

² The purpose of the workgroups is to develop an initial set of action items to address the identified ecological problems. The workgroups could be based on geographic regions, type of problem, species or any other logical division. Each workgroup would produce a set of written actions (not proposals) deemed necessary or useful in addressing problems assigned to the group.

³ The Action Plan will include a broad array of activities geared toward addressing the ecological problems identified in the Summary Technical Report. The Plan would represent a first cut at: 1) identifying types of actions that should be prioritized for the near-term; 2) the appropriate funding vehicles (RFPS, directed programs, reserve accounts, endowments, etc.); and 3) recommendations on broad policy issues.